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Abstract
Autoethnographic writing has often been described by its practitioners as being a therapeutic exercise. However, its public nature and ontological status as social science inquiry distinguish it from private forms of therapeutic writing. This paper uses the lens of Viktor Frankl's logotherapy to offer one explanation for its perceived therapeutic impact. Logotherapy is an existential psychotherapy that focuses on an awareness of the meaning of one's life as an avenue to mental health. This sense of meaning is derived through the realization of three types of "values:" (a) creative values (what the individual gives to the world), (b), experiential values (what the individual receives from the world), and (c) attitudinal values (the ability to change one's attitude toward unchangeable circumstances). Autoethnographic writing offers abundant opportunities to realize creative, experiential and attitudinal values simultaneously. Specific examples from autoethnographic publications are analyzed from within the logotherapy framework.

Introduction
The descriptive term “mesearch” has often been used derisively by mainstream social scientists who do not value forms of inquiry that privilege the researcher’s voice and/or personal lived experiences (see Rothman, 2005). However, as post-positivist worldviews become increasingly more acceptable as paradigms to support social science inquiry, many qualitative researchers are choosing to let their own voices be unambiguously and boldly present in their scholarly writing. These practices sometimes take the form of “reflexive ethnographies” in which the author uses the tools of social science to systematically describe and interpret the ways in which he personally responded to, and was changed by, the experience of fieldwork. Examples include autobiographical narratives written by anthropologists and sociologists as ancillary books to accompany their more conventional scholarship (see Ellis & Bochner, 2003), traditional ethnography framed by autobiographical material in the prologue and epilogue (e.g. Crapanzano, 1980; Shostak, 1981) and explicitly self-conscious educational, anthropological, or sociological research projects that blur the genres of social science, autobiography, and the humanities (e.g. Foltz & Griffin, 1996; Lather & Smithies, 1997).

A more recent and radical form of reflexive inquiry is the practice of autoethnography, in which the writer usually makes her own lived experience a focal point of inquiry from the outset, using the tools of social science to connect her private lived experience to the greater psychological, social, cultural, and/or political worlds shaping it and being shaped by it (Ellis, 2004). For example, in “A Secret Life in a Culture of Thinness: Reflections on Body, Food and Bulimia” (1996), Lisa Tillmann-Healy knits together a traditional literature review with arresting re-creations of scenes exemplifying her personal struggles with the disorder. The methodology and validity criteria supporting the author's treatment of these scenes is derived from her social science training, thus establishing the piece as an example of qualitative inquiry.
The status of autoethnography as social science remains controversial among mainstream researchers, but it has been lauded by some critics for its exceptional ability to “foreground the multiple nature of selfhood…open[ing] up new ways of writing about social life” (Reed-Danahay, 1997, p. 3), for its singular ability to convey the “personal and its relationship to culture” (Ellis, 2004, p. 37), and also for its value as a systematic tool for capitalizing on the unique coincidence in a single individual of rigorous social science training and an insider perspective on suffering (Esping, 2010). These claims acknowledge some of the potential contributions of autoethnography to the universal body of research consumers. The remainder of this article will turn this critical lens backward, focusing instead on the potential therapeutic benefits of autoethnographic writing for the research producers themselves (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Ellis, 2004; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Flemons & Green, 2002b; Richardson, 2000; Tomaselli, Dyll, & Francis, 2008).

Autoethnographers frequently choose to write about personal experiences that exemplify Viktor Frankl’s “tragic triad” of unavoidable pain, irretrievable loss, and guilt (Frankl, 1946/1984, p. 161). For example, the sociologist Carolyn Ellis—arguably the foremost proponent of autoethnography—has addressed such themes as caring for her frail, elderly mother (Ellis, 1995), the death of her husband (Ellis, 1996), and choosing to terminate a pregnancy (Ellis & Bochner, 1992). Therefore, Frankl’s meaning-focused psychotherapy—called “logotherapy”—will be the interpretive framework for this article. Specifically, this paper will demonstrate three ways in which the discovery of meaning may function logotherapeutically for practitioners of autoethnographic forms of scholarly writing.

**Logotherapy**

Logotherapy is an existential psychotherapy that focuses on an awareness of the meaning of one’s life as an avenue to mental health (Simpson & Weiner, 1989). It is derived from the work of the Austrian psychiatrist and existential philosopher Viktor Frankl (1905-1997) and is described in *Man’s Search for Meaning*[^2][^2], Frankl’s autobiographical account of his experiences as a psychiatrist imprisoned in Auschwitz and other concentration camps during the Second World War (1946/1984). Logotherapy, literally translated as “therapy through meaning” (Fabry, 1968/1980, p. xiii), rests on the assertion that the “ultimate” concerns of human beings, such as questions about the meaning of life, death, and suffering, are powerful motivational forces, and that the discovery of meaning can be profoundly healing, especially in circumstances involving the tragic triad of unavoidable suffering, irretrievable loss, and guilt (Frankl, 1946/1984; 1955/1983; 1969/1988).

In a clinical psychotherapy setting, logotherapy clients engage in meaning-centered psychotherapy wherein the individual is “confronted with and reoriented toward the meaning of [his] life” (Frankl, 1946/1984, pp. 120-121). This search for meaning is facilitated through the realization of three types of “values:” (a) creative values, in which a sense of the meaning in one’s life is de-

[^1]: Focusing attention on the personally therapeutic impact of the autoethnographic process is a transgressive act; in mainstream social science, discussions about the purposes and outcomes of scholarship generally focus on its significance for the research consumer, rather than its impact on the producer of the inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Mooney, 1957). Publications that privilege the therapeutic impact of autoethnography on the autoethnographer might provide fodder for critics seeking to undermine the status of autoethnography as social science (Ellis & Bochner, 1996; 2000; Ellis, 2004; see also Mooney, 1957) or be misrepresented to suggest that the present author believes that autoethnography is “just therapy” (C. Ellis, personal communication, May 22, 2009). To do either of these things would constitute misuse of the present paper. The author’s intention is only to focus the lens on a single aspect of a very complex process. Indeed, one claim the author will make in this paper is that the therapeutic impact of autoethnography is dependent, at least in part, on its ontological status as social science.

[^2]: The book would be more appropriately titled *The Human Search for Meaning*. Frankl wrote at a time when people were less concerned with the use of inclusive language.
rived from what one is able to give to the world, (b) experiential values, in which a sense of meaning is derived from what one is able to take from the world, and (c) attitudinal values, in which meaning is derived from the ability to change one’s attitude toward unchangeable circumstances. The process of autoethnographic writing offers numerous opportunities to realize creative, experiential, and attitudinal values simultaneously.

The Acknowledged Therapeutic Impact of Autoethnography

Autoethnographic writing has not previously been described or recognized specifically as a form of logotherapy. However, many sources have acknowledged its otherwise therapeutic impact (e.g. Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Ellis, 2004; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Tomaselli, Dyll, & Francis, 2008). It has been reported as having the potential to “heal wounds” in the writer (Richardson, 2000, p. 931-2), as being useful for finding a place “where [the author] can feel hope” (Flemons & Green 2002a p. 94), for helping the writer to release anger and pain (Richardson, 2000, p. 931-2), and praised for its ability to transform the writer of autoethnography into her or his “own therapist” (Flemons & Green, 2002b p. 116). Carolyn Ellis, for example, stated that she has felt viscerally compelled to write autoethnography when her “world falls apart” and that the process has helped her to “organize [her] life, figure out what was going on, and then put away events and feelings in order to deal with what happened next” (2004, p. 19).

Several explanations have been given for this perceived therapeutic impact. Bochner (in Flemons & Green, 2002b) suggested that reflexive family therapy might be useful as a methodological analog to explain the healing impact of autoethnographic writing in mentoring relationships with aspiring autoethnographers, because both novice autoethnographers and therapy clients are “tellers of life” who seek dialogue with other individuals in order to frame and reframe their life stories. Richardson proposed that the experience of healing may be attributed to the idea that the self who is writing an autoethnographic story may be changed by the process of writing it. To illustrate, she often asks her autoethnography students write from the different subjective positions of individuals in the autoethnographic piece (self, mother, etc.). Sometimes this process ends with the writer changing the labels by which she would like to be known; for example, an individual who begins a piece of writing by labeling herself as a bulimic, may decide by the end of the process that this label does not, in fact, fit her personal circumstances (Flemons & Green, 2002a p. 91-92). A longitudinal case-study by Esping (2009b) found support for this premise in describing a conventional researcher who self-identified as having come from a low-income background when she began an empirical study of low-income students. As the researcher’s study progressed, she became increasingly aware of the financial advantages she had actually experienced in her youth. By the time the researcher’s study was published, she had reframed her childhood experience, and no longer believed that the phrase “low-income” accurately described her own family background.

The perceived therapeutic impact of the autoethnographic writing process is not surprising given that older and more conventional forms of autobiographical writing have long been lauded for their restorative powers. Various approaches to first-person writing are often recommended to psychotherapy clients as an expressive form of therapy, and many sources have documented the therapeutic attributes of autobiographical writing done in these clinical contexts (DeSalvo, 1999; Lepore & Smyth, 2002; Wright & Chung, 2001). Like other so-called “talking cures” (Breuer & Freud, 1895/2000) autobiographical writing seems have the power to “positively shape, or reshape, human experiences, in the context or aftermath of stressful life experiences” (Lepore & Smyth, 2002, p. 3). Among other things, writing about the self has been shown to improve indicators of
physical health such as blood pressure (Davidson et al., 2002), emotional recovery from trauma (McAdams, 1985), and social relationships following difficult life changes (Spera, Buhrfeind, & Pennebaker, 1994).

Another potential reason for the perceived therapeutic impact of autoethnographic writing can be derived from its relationship to the humanities. Many of the standards used for judging the quality of autoethnographies are borrowed from the arts, emphasizing the author’s ability to convey personal lived experiences authentically, but also artfully and poetically (see Bochner & Ellis, 2000; Ellis & Bochner, 1996; Ellis, 2004). Poets, novelists, and other artists often derive inspiration from personal pain, and the act of transforming suffering through autobiographically-based creations may help them to heal (DeSalvo, 1999; Lepore, 2002). The 21st century is witness to the expansion of creative arts therapies such as music therapy, art therapy and drama therapy, which are now being reimbursed by some insurance companies (American Music Therapy Association, 2009). In recent years several journals have been created to address the intersection between the arts, humanities and personal healing. The Healing Muse: A Journal of Literary and Visual Arts and Medical Humanities are two examples.

**Autoethnography as Logotherapy**

Autoethnography shares some characteristics of private, specifically therapeutic autobiographical writing insofar as autoethnographers frequently choose to focus on painful, emotionally and morally complex personal experiences, often corresponding precisely with Frankl’s tragic triad. However, the structures and functions of autoethnography are quite different from private therapeutic writing. Primary among these differences is that the construction of the text is dependent on the author’s training as a social scientist; when autoethnographers write therapeutically, they do so in a public forum, with the expressed purpose of connecting their private lived experience to the larger cultural, social and political contexts around them (Ellis, 2004). Autoethnography’s ontological value as social science, then, is determined in large part by its educational and otherwise beneficial impact on people other than the author. It follows that the therapeutic value of autoethnography may also be somewhat dependent on its public forum. Indeed, one of many reasons for doing autoethnography articulated by Carolyn Ellis is that “autoethnography provides an avenue for doing something meaningful for yourself and the world” [italics mine] (Ellis, 2004, p. xviii). Logotherapy can help explain is meant by “meaningful” in this context by clarifying the ways in autoethnographic writing facilitates the realization of creative, experiential, and attitudinal values.

**Autoethnography and Meaning Discovery Through Creative Values**

In Man’s Search for Meaning (1946/1984), Frankl described a moment when he overcame meaninglessness and began to rise above his inconceivable, unfathomable suffering in the Death Camps. He had been watching some of the other prisoners run into an electric fence, ending their lives quickly. After so much misery, Frankl understood why this could be a perversely-appealing means of escape. However, a new avenue to freedom came to him one day on his way to his work site. Starving, freezing cold, and limping from open sores on his feet, he forced himself to think of other things:

Suddenly I saw myself standing on the platform of a well-lit, warm and pleasant lecture room. In front of me sat an attentive audience on comfortable upholstered seats. I was giving a lecture on the psychology of the concentration camp! All that oppressed me at that moment became objective, seen and de-
scribed from the remote viewpoint of science. By this method I succeeded somehow in rising above the situation, above the sufferings of the moment, and I observed them as if they were already of the past. Both I and my troubles became the object of an interesting psychoscientific study undertaken by myself. What does Spinoza say in his Ethics?—“Affectus, qui passio est, desinit esse passio simulatque eius claram et distinctam formamus ideam.” Emotion, which is suffering, ceases to be suffering as soon as we form a clear and precise picture of it (Frankl, 1946/1984, pp. 94-5).

After the war his “clear and precise picture” of suffering was made manifest in Man’s Search For Meaning (1946/1984) and in many subsequent books, articles, and presentations given in well-lit, warm, and pleasant rooms around the world. This illustrates meaning discovery through creative values. Frankl realized during his imprisonment that despite his own desperate condition, there was much good that he—a trained psychiatrist who also possessed an insider’s understanding of profound suffering—could do to help other people after the war. He recognized that the singular combination of his behavioral science training and prisoner status was unique, and therefore worth preserving for its potential to preserve others (see also Esping, 2009a; 2009b).

Frankl credited his dedication to the meaningful goal of eventually publishing and lecturing about his concentration camp experience for having kept him alive until liberation (1946/1984; 1955/1983). In offering his unique perspective on human suffering to the world, he too experienced healing. Carolyn Ellis’s body of work also suggests that some of the therapeutic impact of autoethnography also comes from the realization of creative values. She has stated that she sometimes receives emails and letters from readers who indicate that a particular sociological publication has “changed their lives.” This public response to autoethnography, she says, is one of its “greatest rewards” and is like “manna from heaven for an autoethnographer. That is what you hope for—to change your life and the life of others—for the better” (2004, p. 35). The impact of this creative value is echoed in the works of many other autoethnographers. Indeed, one frequently articulated standards criterion for judging the quality of an autoethnographic study is that the publication have a demonstrable, positive impact on the world and/or readers’ lives (Ellis, 2004; see also Denzin, 2000; Fine, 1994, Richardson, 2000b).

It is important to emphasize that the realization of creative values through the practice of autoethnography does not come without risks. Frankl noted that it takes “courage to tell of very intimate experiences,” and he initially intended to publish Man’s Search for Meaning anonymously, using his prison number only (1946/1984, pp. 24-5.) The public nature of autoethnographic writing exposes authors to emotional and professional vulnerability that is not present in private therapeutic writing (see Bochner & Ellis, 1996; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Ellis, 2004). Ellis (2004, p. xx) acknowledged that the publication process is frequently accompanied by some degree of “emotional turmoil.” For example, when Ellis and her partner Arthur Bochner published their co-constructed narrative about their decision to terminate a pregnancy, they opened their personal decision-making process to possible censure from family, colleagues, students, and the larger academic community (see Ellis, 2004; Ellis & Berger, 2002; Ellis & Bochner, 1992). Although Ellis credits this piece of writing for possibly saving her relationship with Bochner, the responses from readers have occasionally been emotionally distressing, demonstrating that publishing autoethnography can feel simultaneously healing and “excruciatingly” painful (Ellis, 2004, p. 33).
The descriptive juxtaposition of words like “healing” and “painful” to explain the process of writing and publishing autoethnography is entirely consistent with the assertion made by Viktor Frankl that positive and negative experiences are not always binary opposites. Meaningful experiences are generally positive experiences, but they sometimes occur during painful situations. Further, painful experiences are sometimes necessary in order to make meaningful experiences manifest (Frankl, 1946/1984; 1955/1983; 1969/1988; see also Esping, 2009a; 2009b).

**Autoethnography and Meaning Discovery Through Experiential Values**

Experiential values are the second way to find meaning. Whereas the realization of creative values allows autoethnographers to discover meaning through what they give to the world through their publications, experiential values may help them derive meaning from what the world gives to them through the process and product of writing. One illustration is the love a person feels for another person. For example, Carolyn Ellis’s love for her husband Gene was profoundly meaningful to her, independent from the purpose-filled creative work she undertook when writing about this loss in her autoethnographic book Final Negotiations (1995). She would not have had to write an autoethnography to discover meaning in this way. However, the process of writing this book also felt therapeutic to Ellis because it facilitated the realization of other experiential values, such as self-knowledge, catharsis, and a means to organize her thinking during a chaotic time. She indicated that the process of systematic sociological introspection she used as a method of inquiry advanced her own understanding of her grief, and this helped her to adapt to the psychological stress of her bereavement:

As sociologists, Gene and I spent a lot of time analyzing our relationship and his illness, and I thought about it when I was alone, too. Thinking sociologically provided a coping mechanism. I wanted to write my story to help others understand their experiences sociologically…I wanted to provide a story to which they could compare their experiences. When Gene was dying, that’s what I looked for and had difficulty finding. I wanted to know I wasn’t alone (Ellis, 2004, p. 19)…

I felt compelled to share this part of the human condition—loss and illness. I had used sociology to grasp these events, and I had gained an understanding of sociological concepts and processes from the experience. Something spiritual, emotional—or from my “gut”—compelled me to write down what happened (Ellis, 2004, p. 33).

It is important to note here that the therapeutic impact of meaning-discovery through experiential values may also result in new emotional pain. Unlike pain derived from meaning-seeking through creative values, which is derived from possible public censure, the potential pain accompanying the realization of experiential values comes from within, from unflattering or otherwise uncomfortable truths that the researcher comes to understand herself. As Ellis notes:

Usually some degree of emotional turmoil accompanies the vulnerability required to scrutinize yourself and reveal to others what you find. Almost always, the insights you gain about yourself and the world around you make the pain bearable, even welcome at times (2004, p. xx).
This seeming contradiction serves to illustrate the complex and sometimes paradoxical process of finding meaning in suffering; negative descriptors like “emotional turmoil” are often coincident with positive descriptors like “welcome” and “mak[ing] the pain bearable.” The new potential for pain may be necessary in order to make the therapeutic meaning of the experiences apparent (Frankl, 1946/1984; 1955/1983; 1969/1988; see also Esping, 2009a; 2009b).

**Autoethnography and Meaning Discovery Through Attitudinal Values**

The realization of attitudinal values is the third way to discover meaning. Some life circumstances cannot be escaped, such as the tragic triad of unavoidable pain, irretrievable loss, and guilt (Frankl, 1946/1984, p. 161). However, individuals always have a choice as to how to respond to these internal and external limitations. Even when a person’s body is imprisoned through captivity or physical disease, or when a person’s mind is held captive by psychological distress, he may choose to view the situation in a way that acknowledges meaning and/or brings something positive to the world. For this reason, logotherapists view the ability to change one’s attitude as the “last of human freedoms” (Allport, 1984, p. 12).

Frankl realized this form of internal freedom in the death camps. He knew that he could not escape the physical and psychological horrors of his circumstances, but he could use his professional expertise as a psychiatrist to study those circumstances. This decision had potential to help other people and himself. He understood that had access to insights that a psychiatrist (who was not also a prisoner) or a prisoner (who was not also a psychiatrist) might not have (see Esping, 2009a; 2010). In acknowledging this unique position he was capitalizing on what W.E.B. Dubois called “double consciousness” (1903/1994).

The anthropologist Deborah Reed-Danahay (1997) sees double consciousness as a useful lens for understanding the value of autoethnography to research consumers. Autoethnographers are able to draw on the wisdom of personal lived experience and their professional training as social scientists simultaneously in a single publication, offering a uniquely valuable perspective to readers. However, double consciousness can also be understood from within the logotherapy framework as a means for facilitating attitudinal values. Autoethnographers who cannot change their painful life circumstances can write about them. In doing so, they can contribute something important and meaningful to the world and to themselves.

**Conclusion**

Writing autoethnography can be a transformative and therapeutic response to pain because it helps the author discover meaning by assisting others (a creative value), understanding himself (an experiential value), and appreciating the opportunities inherent in his singularly valuable double consciousness (an attitudinal value). Therefore, autoethnography may in fact be a powerful and previously unrecognized form of self-administered logotherapy. Researchers who engage in autoethnographic practices should be aware that doing so may open them to new pain derived from possible public censure and immersion in uncomfortable personal reflection. However, these risks are counterbalanced by the logotherapeutic impact of autoethnographic writing for individuals who create these uniquely personal and meaningful forms of scholarship.
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